



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,386	11/13/2001	Philip J. Christian	476-2063	5418
23644	7590	09/22/2005	EXAMINER	
BARNES & THORNBURG			LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D	
P.O. BOX 2786			ART UNIT	
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786			PAPER NUMBER	

2152

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/991,386	CHRISTIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Victor Lesniewski	2152	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.


AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____

VZ


Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

The applicant has argued that the combination of Rekhter and Wong does not disclose "an IS-IS communications network nor the step of sending information about the selected IP address to nodes in the IS-IS communications network." In response, it is believed to be clear that the combination of Rekhter and Wong discloses an IS-IS communications network as claimed. Specifically, Rekhter discloses a network of routers, a router being an intermediate system. Rekhter even states use of the ISO IS-IS routing protocol. See Rekhter, column 11, line 59 through column 12, line 3. Furthermore, the previous citation to Rekhter, column 12, lines 20-28, clearly satisfies the limitation for "sending information about the selected IP address to nodes in the IS-IS communications network." Here Rekhter states exchanging and advertising tag information with other routers. This tag information includes IP addresses or related information. This citation has not been discussed by the applicant in his argument although it was directly applied to the limitation being argued.

The applicant has argued that the combination of Rekhter and Wong does not disclose "allocating a unique IP address to a node since, it is clear from the disclosure of Wong, that a client system can have more than one IP address associated with it." Here it is noted that Wong is focused on uniquely identifying a client using IP addresses and trusted identifiers. Although client systems may be associated with multiple IP addresses in Wong's system, Wong does disclose a unique IP address for a specific individual client called a "learned" IP address. See the previous citation to Wong, column 3, lines 1-11.

The applicant has argued that there is no motivation to combine Rekhter and Wong. In response, it is maintained that the motivation presented in the final action dated 7/15/2005 is sufficient motivation to combine. See paragraph 11 of the action. In addition it is noted that this motivation to combine has not been addressed by the applicant in his arguments. The applicant has argued that "These references address entirely different technical issues," however, both systems utilize routers that track IP address information throughout a network.

Thus claims 1-16, 19, and 20 remain rejected as presented in the final action dated 7/15/2005.